

### REMARKS

Claims 1-29 are pending in the application. Claims 3, 5-7, 11, 13, 14, 16, 17, 20-22 and 25-29 have been withdrawn from consideration. Claims 1, 2, 4, 8, 9, 10, 12, 15, 18, 19, 23 and 24 are rejected. The Examiner is respectfully requested to reconsider and withdraw the rejections in view of the amendments and remarks herein.

#### Drawing Objections

The specification has been amended to note that only one button 8 and only one contact element 9 are illustrated. Thus, it is submitted that the drawings are consistent with the specification and that this objection has been overcome.

#### Specification Objections

Paragraph [0027] has been amended to note that only one button 8 and only one contact element 9 are illustrated, consistent with the illustration.

#### Claim Rejections – 35 USC § 103

All of the non-withdrawn claims stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. 103(a) as being obvious over U.S. Pat. No. 7,150,285 to Saito et al. ("Saito") in view of U.S. Pat. No. 5,189,792 to Otsuka ("Otsuka"). As understood, the rejection is based on the premise that while Saito does not disclose an additional connector other than the connector coupling the shaver to the auxiliary device for charging, Otsuka shows a shaver with a charging connector located elsewhere and that therefore a shaver with both connectors would have been obvious. St. Regis Paper is cited for the proposition that mere duplication of essential working parts is not inventive. This rejection is respectfully traversed.

Applicants agree that "it would be speculative to assume that [the recess shown at the base of Saito's shaver] is an electrical connector." (OA, page 6). Applicants also agree that Otsuka shows a shaver with an electrical connection at the end opposite the shaving head. However, Applicants dispute that the combination of these two references, reasonably

considered at the time of the invention, would have led one of mere ordinary skill in the art to the invention as claimed, and warn against adopting reasoning based on the admittedly speculative interpretation of the square recess in Saito's shaver as reminiscent of a connector aperture.

The invention as compared to either of these references involves more than the mere duplication of essential working parts. Although each of the pending claims recite a plurality of connectors, these connectors are not duplicates but are characterized differently: the first connector is characterized as being configured to couple with an associated connector of the auxiliary device, while the second connector is either configured to couple the primary electrical device for receiving electrical or electromagnetic energy (claim 1) or is spaced apart from the first connector and configured to connect the battery to an auxiliary power source (claim 12 and claim 23). In the illustrated embodiment, the first connector (including contact elements 9 on the rear surface of the shaver) connect to the shaver cleaner for charging and/or data transmission, while the second connector (including appliance socket 13 at the far end of the shaver) functions to alternatively connect the shaver to an electrical outlet, for example, and therefore have different uses and are not duplicative.

Each piece of prior art cited against these claims contains only a single electrical connector – Saito on the back face of the shaver and Otsuka at the end of the shaver. Saito's connector provides a means for charging his shaver, and there is nothing about Saito's disclosure that suggests, or would encourage the ordinarily skilled artisan, to provide another connector to charge the shaver separately from the cleaner. Similarly, Otsuka's connector provides a means for charging his shaver, and there is nothing about Otsuka's disclosure that suggests, or would encourage the ordinarily skilled artisan, to provide another connector to charge his shaver. The crux of the logic of the rejection is that it would have been obvious to build a shaver with *both* Saito's connector and Otsuka's connector, but there is nothing about either reference that would have suggested such a modification, nor is the conclusion reached other than by hindsight reconstruction using the claims as a template. It was not until Applicants' explanation underlying their concept of providing a separate charging connector, such as for charging a shaver in absence of an associated cleaner, that the combination springs to mind. Indeed, shaver

cleaning systems have been in commercial use for years, without any indication before Applicants' invention of any consideration of providing separate connectors on a single shaver.

Applicants understand that when considering claims to inventions that do not involve complex technological advances it is particularly difficult to avoid the natural tendency toward hindsight, and encourage the Examiner to be mindful of the robust corpus of case law on this subject, including the recent Supreme Court KSR decision, of which the Examiner is certainly aware.

In conclusion, Applicants ask that this rejection be reconsidered and withdrawn, and that the withdrawn dependent claims be reinstated as depending from allowed base claims.

### CONCLUSION


It is believed that all of the pending claims have been addressed. However, the absence of a reply to a specific rejection, issue or comment does not signify agreement with or concession of that rejection, issue or comment. In addition, because the arguments made above may not be exhaustive, there may be reason for patentability of any or all pending claims (or other claims) that have not been expressed. Finally, nothing in this paper should be construed as an intent to concede any issue with regard to any claim, except as specifically stated in this paper. Applicants respectfully request consideration of any filed IDS' not previously considered, by initialing and returning each Form 1449 or SB/08.

All fees are being paid concurrently herewith on the Electronic Filing System (EFS) by way of Deposit Account authorization. Please apply all charges or credits to Deposit Account No. 06-1050, referencing Attorney Docket No. 02894-0728US1.

Respectfully submitted,

Date: \_\_\_\_\_

June 16, 2009

  
\_\_\_\_\_  
James W. Babineau  
Reg. No. 42,276

Fish & Richardson P.C.  
One Congress Plaza, Suite 810  
111 Congress Avenue  
Austin, TX 78701  
Telephone: (512) 472-5070  
Facsimile: (877) 769-7945